

Amendment

Reply to Office Action dated July 3, 2007

Page 13 of 15

REMARKS

The foregoing amendments and these remarks are in response to the Office Action dated July 3, 2007. Applicant hereby requests a three month Extension of Time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

At the time of the Office Action, claims 1-38 were pending. In the Office Action, claims 1-37 were objected to under 37 CFR §1.75(i). Claims 10, 22, 29 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1-31 and 34-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Claims 32, 33 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The objections and rejections are discussed in more detail below.

I. Claim Inconsistencies

Applicant has noted that claims 39-53 have been cancelled. In addition, although the preliminary amendment filed with the national phase application listed claims 1-38 as being "Original", applicant's current representatives have noticed that the claims so filed were not in fact the claims as originally filed with the PCT application. All claims are further amended herein, but applicant wishes to note the error in the previously filed preliminary amendment.

II. Claim Objections

In the Office Action, claims 1-37 were objected to under 37 CFR §1.75(i) which states that each element or step of the claimed invention should be separated by a line indentation. Appropriate corrections are made herein to claim 1, and withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 10, 22, 29 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended the claims in a manner believed to overcome the rejections. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Amendment

Reply to Office Action dated July 3, 2007

Page 14 of 15

IV. Rejections to the claims based upon Art

Claims 1-31 and 34-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,283,753 to Willoughby ("Willoughby"). Claims 32, 33 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Willoughby.

Regarding Willoughby, it should be noted that, as shown in for example in Fig. 26B, that Fig 27A and 27B are describing a replica assembly (nr 51+55+53 screw + 61) with an angulated impression coping 57. Willoughby needs to get access through the model as in Fig 27B to the replica (since angulations and closed tray impression technique prevents easy access to the screw). The normal way to get access to the screw would be through the impression coping 57 to the impression screw that is fastened in the replica. Hence, as the Willoughby assembly is part of the replica, it is to be molded into a model in the lab, and is not an impression coping with an extension through the impression material as recited in the present claims.

Further, Willoughby presents a good example of a system using different screws and additional assembly parts for different applications, (see Fig. 25A and Fig. 26A), while the present system teaches one screw with an extension means such as a tube. This tube can be bent if made in appropriate material such as plastic, as discussed in the specifications. Thus, there is no need with the present system for a clinician to maintain a stock of different screws and parts for use in different moulding techniques. This provides significant advantages over systems such as those described in Willoughby.

For the foregoing reasons, the independent claims are believed to relate to patentable subject matter, and to be in condition for allowance. The dependent claims are believed allowable because of their dependence upon an allowable base claim, and because of the further features recited.

V. Conclusion

Applicant has made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the prior art, and it is thus believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. Nevertheless, Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant

Amendment

Reply to Office Action dated July 3, 2007

Page 15 of 15

respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1-3-08


Mark D. Passler
Registration No. 40,764
Sarah E. Smith
Registration No. 50,488
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000